

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Prior to this amendment, claims 1-29 were pending in this application. In this amendment, claims 1, 10, 12, 20, 21, and 29 are amended, claims 5, 16 and 25 are canceled, and claims 30-38 are added. Accordingly claims 1-4, 6-15, 17-24, and 26-38 are now presented for examination and allowance. No new matter has been added, support for the amendments and new claims is found throughout the application, see for example, paragraphs 27-33.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

In the pending Office Action, claims 1-4, 9-15, 20-24, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,125,283 to Kolev, et al (“Kolev”).

Kolev describes techniques to “resolve the problem of multi-mode mobile terminal service selection protocols where a subscriber identification has been determined to be invalid.” (Kolev col. 3, lines 7-10). Kolev describes that a terminal accesses different networks depending on a subscriber identity and if the network allows access without a valid subscriber identity. For example, Kolev describes

The mobile terminal includes a transceiver means for communicating over a first and a second wireless communication network. The terminal further includes means for determining if the first network allows access without a valid subscriber identity and if the second network allows access without a valid subscriber identity. In addition, the mobile terminal includes a means for determining if the subscriber identity of the mobile terminal is valid for the first network or the second network. Finally, the mobile terminal includes means for controlling the transceiver means so as to communicate over a select one of the first or the second network which allows access without a valid subscriber identity if the subscriber identity of the mobile terminal is invalid in both the first network and the second network.

(Kolev, col. 3, lines 41-55)

Independent claims 1, 10, 12, 21, and 29 have been amended, and claims 30-38 added, to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. No new matter has been added, see for example, paragraphs 28-33 of the original specification. Claims 5, 16 and 25 have been canceled and their limitations inserted into their respective independent claims.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite receiving an origination request for a call including parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string. Claim 1 also recites determining which communications networks from a plurality of available communications networks support the call based upon the parameters and the information, thereby identifying compatible networks, and determining if the call is allowed on at least one of the compatible networks, and if so, originating the call on one of the allowed compatible network. Support is in the specification, for example in paragraphs [0027]-[0029].

In contrast to Kolev's concerns with whether or not a subscriber identity is valid or invalid, claim 1 recites determining if a request for a call is allowed on a network based upon parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string. In other words, once Kolev determines that a terminal can access a network, then access is granted. This is unlike claim 1 that allows access and originates a call to a network if the network supports the parameters of the request and the network is an allowed network.

Determining if a call is allowed on a compatible network offers many advantages. For example, a parent may provide a wireless communication device to a child that is programmed to only allow the child to call certain telephone numbers on desired networks. Likewise, it may be desirable to restrict particular groups or categories of calls to specific networks, even if other available networks are compatible.

Thus, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Kolev. Claims 10, 12, 21, 29, 30 and 34 include similar limitations, and for similar reasons these claims are also patentable over Kolev. In addition, claims 2-4, 6-9, 11, 13-15, 17-20, 22-24, 26-28, 31-33, and 35-39 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 12, 21, 30, and 34 respectively and, for at least the reasons given above, are also in condition for allowance.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

In the pending Office Action, claims 5-8, 16-19, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kolev in view of U.S. Pub. 2003/0103607 A1 to Feakes ("Feakes").

Claims 6-8, 17-19, and 26-28 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, and 21 respectively. As discussed above, Kolev does not describe all of the limitations recited in claims 1, 12, and 21 and Feakes does not overcome this deficiency.

Feakes describes that a “user of a mobile telephone interacts with an internet server (or other remote service) using the browsing capability of the mobile telephone. If the user requests or requires a real-time audio streaming service, then the audio is delivered to the end user not through the internet features of the telephone, but rather through the telephone system using the voice telephony capability of the mobile telephone.” (Feakes, paragraph 0009).

Feakes does not describe receiving an origination request for a call, including parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string, and determining if a call is allowed on a network based upon the parameters, as recited in claim 1. Further, there would be no motivation to combine the teachings of Feakes with Kolev because Kolev is concerned with determining if a terminal can access a network, while Feakes already has access to a network before requesting audio. Even if it were possible to combine the teachings of Kolev and Feakes the combination would not describe all of the limitations of claim 1. The combination would use Kolev’s techniques to access a network then, after the network is access, Feakes would receive audio over the network. Thus, the combination, even if possible, would not describe receiving an origination request for a call, including parameters that include service parameters and a dialing string information, and determining if a call is allowed on a network based upon the parameters, as recited in claim 1. Claims 12 and 21 recite limitations similar to claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-8, 17-19, and 26-28 are patentable over Kolev and Feakes, both individually and in combination.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the remarks presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are patentable over the references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application is solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 8, 2007  
QUALCOMM Incorporated  
5775 Morehouse Drive  
San Diego, California 92121-2779  
Telephone: (858) 658-5928  
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

By: /James D. McFarland/  
**James D. McFarland**  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,544